Not All Multi-Valued Partial CFL Functions Are Refined by Single-Valued Functions*

Tomoyuki Yamakami†

Abstract: Multi-valued partial CFL functions are computed by one-way nondeterministic pushdown automata equipped with write-only output tapes. We give an answer to a fundamental question, raised by Konstantinidis, Santean, and Yu [Act. Inform. 43 (2007) 395–417], of whether all multi-valued partial CFL functions can be refined by single-valued partial CFL functions. We negatively solve this question by presenting a special multi-valued partial CFL function as an example function and by proving that no refinement of this particular function becomes a single-valued partial CFL function. This contrasts an early result of Kobayashi [Inform. Control 15 (1969) 95–109] that multi-valued partial NFA functions are always refined by single-valued NFA functions, where NFA functions are computed by nondeterministic finite automata with output tapes. Our example function turns out to be unambiguously 2-valued, and thus we obtain a stronger separation result, in which no refinement of unambiguously 2-valued partial CFL functions can be single-valued. For the proof, we first introduce a new concept of colored automata having no output tapes but having "colors," which can simulate pushdown automata with constant-space output tapes. We then conduct an extensive combinatorial analysis on the behaviors of transition records of stack contents (called stack histories) of colored automata.

Keywords: multi-valued partial function, CFL function, NFA function, refinement, pushdown automaton, context-free language, colored automaton, stack history

arXiv:1610.07175v1 [cs.FL] 23 Oct 2016

1 Resolving a Fundamental Question

Since early days of automata and formal language theory, multi-valued partial functions,‡ computed by various types of automata equipped with supplemental *write-only output tapes*, have been investigated extensively. To keep a restricted nature of memory usage, we require the automata to write output symbols *in an oblivious way*; namely, the automata move their output-tape heads to new blank cells whenever they write non-blank output symbols. We succinctly refer such output tapes to "write only." Among these types of functions, we now intend to spotlight *CFL functions* (also known as *algebraic transductions*), which are computed by *one-way nondeterministic pushdown automata* (succinctly abbreviated as *npda's*) whose input-tape heads move only in one direction (from the left to the right) with write-only output tapes. Such functions were formally discussed in 1963 by Evey [2] and Fisher [4]. The acronym CFL stands for *context-free languages* because, with no output tapes, the machines recognize precisely context-free languages. Therefore, those functions naturally inherit certain distinctive traits from the context-free languages; however, their behaviors are in essence quite different from the behaviors of the language counterpart. Such intriguing properties of those functions have been addressed occasionally in the past literature (e.g., [1, 2, 4, 7, 12, 14]).

Npda's can produce various output values on their output tapes along numerous computation paths. When the number of output values is always limited to at most one, we obtain *single-valued* partial functions. Such single-valued partial functions are obviously seen as multi-valued partial functions, but multi-valued partial functions are, in general, not single-valued. For expressing a relationship between multi-valued and single-valued partial functions, it is therefore more appropriate to ask a question of whether multi-valued partial functions can be *refined* by single-valued partial functions, where "refinement" is a notion discussed initially for NP functions [8] and it refers to a certain natural restriction on the outcomes of multi-valued functions. To be more precise, we say that a function g is a *refinement* (also called "uniformization" [7]) of another function f if and only if (i) f and g have the same domain and (ii) for every input x in the domain of f, all output values of g on x are also output values of f on the same input x. When g is particularly single-valued, g acts as a "selection" function that picks exactly one value from a set of output values of f on x whenever the set is nonempty. This refinement notion is known to play a significant role also in language recognition. In a polynomial-time setting, for instance, if we can effectively find an accepting

*An extended abstract appeared in the Proceedings of the 8th IFIP International Conference on Theoretical Computer Science (IFIP TCS 2014), Rome, Italy, September 1–3, 2014, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer, vol. 8705, pp. 136–150.

†Present Affiliation: Faculty of Engineering, University of Fukui, 3-9-1 Bunkyo, Fukui 910-8507, Japan

‡Throughout this paper, we often call those multi-valued partial functions just "functions."

computation path of any polynomial-time nondeterministic Turing machine, then every *multi-valued partial NP function* (which is computed by a certain polynomial-time nondeterministic Turing machine) has a refinement in the form of single-valued NP function. Therefore, this "no-refinement" claim for multi-valued partial NP functions immediately leads to a negative answer to the long-standing P =?NP question. More generally, multi-valued partial Σ_k^{P}-functions in the so-called *NPMV-hierarchy* are not, in general refined by single-valued partial Σ_k^{P}-functions as long as the polynomial(-time) hierarchy forms an infinite hierarchy [3, 9].

Returning to automata theory, we can discuss a similar refinement question on CFL functions in hope that we resolve it without any unproven assumption, such as the separation of the polynomial(-time) hierarchy. In this line of research, the first important step was taken by Kobayashi [6] in 1969. He gave an affirmative answer to the refinement question on *multi-valued partial NFA functions*, which are computed by *one-way nondeterministic finite automata* (or *nfa's*, in short) with write-only output tapes; namely, multi-valued partial NFA functions can be refined by appropriate single-valued partial NFA functions. Konstantinidis, Santean, and Yu [7] discussed the same question on multi-valued partial CFL functions. They managed to obtain a partial affirmative answer but left the whole question open, probably due to a technical limitation of their algebraic treatments of CFL functions.

This paper is focused on CFL functions whose output values are produced by npda's that halt in linear time[§] (that is, all computation paths terminate in time $O(n)$, where n is the size of input) with write-only output tapes. By adopting succinct notations from [12, 14], we express as CFLMV the collection of all such CFL functions and we also write CFLSV for a collection of all single-valued partial functions in CFLMV. As a concrete example of our CFL function, let us consider f defined by setting $f(1^n\#x)$ to be the set of all substrings of x of length between 1 and n, exactly when $1 \leq n \leq |x|$. This function f is a multi-valued partial CFL function and the following function g is an obvious refinement of f: let $g(1^n\#x)$ be composed only of the first symbol of x whenever $1 \leq n \leq |x|$. Notice that g belongs to CFLSV.

For a further discussion, it is beneficial to introduce another succinct notation for refinement. Given two classes $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ of multi-valued partial functions, we write $\mathcal{F} \sqsubseteq_{ref} \mathcal{G}$ if every function in $\mathcal{F}$ can be refined by a certain function in $\mathcal{G}$. Using this notation, the aforementioned refinement question regarding CFL functions can be rephrased neatly as follows.

Question 1.1 *Is it true that* $\mathrm{CFLMV} \sqsubseteq_{ref} \mathrm{CFLSV}$*?*

Various extensions of CFLMV of Question 1.1 are also possible. We state one such possible extension. Yamakami [14] lately introduced a functional hierarchy $\{\Sigma_k^{\mathrm{CFL}}\mathrm{MV}, \Pi_k^{\mathrm{CFL}}\mathrm{MV} \mid k \geq 1\}$ (called the *CFLMV hierarchy*), which is built upon multi-valued partial CFL functions by applying Turing relativization and a complementation operation (see Section 4), analogously to the aforementioned NPMV hierarchy $\{\Sigma_k^{\mathrm{P}}\mathrm{MV}, \Pi_k^{\mathrm{P}}\mathrm{MV} \mid k \geq 1\}$ over multi-valued partial NP functions [3, 9]. Its single-valued version is customarily denoted by $\{\Sigma_k^{\mathrm{CFL}}\mathrm{SV}, \Pi_k^{\mathrm{CFL}}\mathrm{SV} \mid k \geq 1\}$. The function g defined as $g(w) = \{x \in \{0,1\}^* \mid \exists\, u, v\, [w = uxxv]\}$ for each $w \in \{0,1\}^*$ is an example of function in $\Sigma_2^{\mathrm{CFL}}\mathrm{MV}$.

Our focal question, Question 1.1, can be further generalized to the following.

Question 1.2 *Does* $\Sigma_k^{\mathrm{CFL}}\mathrm{MV} \sqsubseteq_{ref} \Sigma_k^{\mathrm{CFL}}\mathrm{SV}$ *hold for each index* $k \geq 1$*?*

Yamakami [14] shed partial light on this general question when $k \geq 3$. He was able to show that, for every index $k \geq 3$, $\Sigma_{k-1}^{\mathrm{CFL}} = \Sigma_k^{\mathrm{CFL}}$ implies $\Sigma_k^{\mathrm{CFL}}\mathrm{MV} \sqsubseteq_{ref} \Sigma_k^{\mathrm{CFL}}\mathrm{SV}$, where Σ_k^{CFL} is the kth level of the *CFL hierarchy* [13], which is a language counterpart of the CFLMV hierarchy. Since the collapse of the CFL hierarchy is closely related to that of the polynomial hierarchy, an answer to Question 1.2 (when $k \geq 3$) might be quite difficult to obtain. Nevertheless, the remaining cases of $k = 1, 2$ have been left unsolved.

In this paper, without relying on any unproven assumption, we solve Question 1.2 negatively when $k = 1$; therefore, our result completely settles Question 1.1. Our solution actually gives an essentially stronger statement than what we have discussed so far. To clarify this point, we introduce a new function class CFL2V as the collection of all functions f in CFLMV satisfying the condition that the number of output values of f on each input should be at most 2. We obtain the following statement.

Theorem 1.3 $\mathrm{CFL2V} \not\sqsubseteq_{ref} \mathrm{CFLSV}$.

Since $\mathrm{CFLSV} \subseteq \mathrm{CFL2V} \subseteq \mathrm{CFLMV}$ holds, Theorem 1.3 clearly leads to a negative answer to Question

[§]This linear time-bound ensures that every CFL function produces only at most an exponential number of output values and it therefore becomes an NP function. This fact naturally extends a well-known containment of CFL $\subseteq$ NP. If no execution time bound is imposed, on the contrary, then a function computed by an npda that nondeterministically produces every string on its output tape on each input also becomes a "valid" CFL function.

1.1. The proof of the theorem is essentially a manifestation of the following intuition: since an npda relies on limited functionality of its memory device, it cannot simulate simultaneously two independent computation paths of another npda along a single computation path.

Instead of providing a detailed proof for Theorem 1.3, we wish to present a simple and clear argument to demonstrate a slightly stronger result regarding a subclass of CFL2V. To justify an introduction of such a subclass, we need to address that even if a function f is single-valued, its underlying npda on each input may have numerous computation paths producing the same value of f. Controlling the number of those particular computation paths may be difficult for npda's. Let us call an npda N with a write-only output tape *unambiguous* if, for every input x and any output value y, N has exactly one accepting computation path producing y. Let UCFL2V denote the class of all 2-valued partial functions computed in linear time by unambiguous npda's with output tapes. Succinctly, those functions are called *unambiguously 2-valued*. Obviously, UCFL2V $\subseteq$ CFL2V holds.

Throughout this paper, we wish to show the following stronger separation result (than Theorem 1.3), which is referred to as the "main theorem" in the subsequent sections.

Theorem 1.4 (Main Theorem) UCFL2V $\not\sqsubseteq_{ref}$ CFLSV.

Following a brief explanation of key notions and notation in Section 2, we will give in Section 3 the proof of Theorem 1.4, completing the proof of Theorem 1.3 as well. Our proof will start in Sections 3.1 with a presentation of our example function h_3, a member of UCFL2V. The proof will then proceed, by way of contradiction, with a faulty assumption that a certain refinement, say, g of h_3 exists in CFLSV. Thus, there is an npda computing g using a write-only output tape. For our proof,however, we wish to avoid the handling of the output tape of this npda and thus seek a simpler model of automaton for an easier analysis of its behaviors. For this purpose, we will introduce in Section 3.2 a new concept of "colored" automaton—a new type of automaton having no output tape but having "colors"—which can simulate an npda equipped with an output tape that computes g, To lead to the desired contradiction, we are focused on particular accepting colored computation paths of the colored automaton and see how the computation paths can turn into different colors if we change certain portions of input strings. The proof will further exploit special properties of such a colored automaton by analyzing the behaviors of its time transition record of stack contents (called a *stack history*) generated by this colored automaton. The detailed combinatorial analysis of the stack history will be presented in Sections 3.3–3.6. The analysis itself is interesting on its own right. The proof of the main theorem will be split into two cases. In Case 1, the proof is supported by two key statements, Proposition 3.7 and Proposition 3.16 (for a special case, Proposition 3.13), in which we estimate the height of stack contents at certain points of a stack history. These estimations provide two contradictory upper and lower bounds of the height, leading to the desired contradiction. In Case 2, we transform this case back to Case 1 by constructing a "reversed" colored automaton in Proposition 3.18 in Section 3.6.

We expect that colored automata may find useful applications to other issues arisen in automata theory and we hope that our analysis of stack history may shed another insight into the behaviors of other automata models.

2 Preparation for the Proof

Before proceeding onto the proof of the main theorem (Theorem 1.4) in Section 3, we wish to explain key notions and notations necessary to read through the rest of this paper.

Let $\mathbb{N}$ denote the set of all *natural numbers* (i.e., nonnegative integers) and define $\mathbb{N}^+ = \mathbb{N} - \{0\}$. Given two integers m and n with $m \leq n$, the notation $[m, n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ denotes an integer interval $\{m, m+1, m+2, \ldots, n\}$. When $n \geq 1$, we abbreviate $[1, n]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ as $[n]$. All *logarithms* are to base 2 unless otherwise stated. Given a finite set A, $\mathcal{P}(A)$ denotes the *power set* of A. The notation $|A|$ for a finite set A refers to its *cardinality* (i.e., the number of all distinct elements in A).

An *alphabet* is a finite nonempty set of "symbols" or "letters." Given such an alphabet Σ, a *string* x *over* Σ is a finite series of symbols taken from Σ and $|x|$ denotes the *length* (or *size*) of x. We use λ to express the *empty string*. The set of all strings over Σ is denoted by Σ^* and a *language over* Σ is a subset of Σ^*. Given two strings x and y over the same alphabet, the notation $x \sqsubseteq y$ indicates that x is a *substring* of y; namely, for certain two strings u and v, y equals uxv. Moreover, for a string x and an index $i \in [|x|]$, $(x)_i$ expresses a unique substring made up only of the first i symbols of x. Such a string is also called a *prefix*. Clearly, $(x)_i \sqsubseteq x$ holds.

A *multi-valued partial function* generally maps elements of a given set to subsets of another (possibly

the same) set. Slightly different from a conventional notation[¶] (e.g., [8, 9]), we write $f : A \to \mathcal{P}(B)$ for two sets A and B to refer to a multi-valued partial function that takes an element in A as input and produces a certain number of elements in B. In particular, when $f(x) = \emptyset$, we conventionally say that $f(x)$ is *undefined*. The *domain* of f, denoted by $\mathrm{dom}(f)$, is therefore the set $\{x \in A \mid f(x) \text{ is not undefined }\}$. Given a constant $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, f is said to be *k-valued* if $|f(x)| \leq k$ holds for every input x in A. For two multi-valued partial functions $f, g : A \to \mathcal{P}(B)$, we say that g is a *refinement* of f (or f is *refined by* g), denoted by $f \sqsubseteq_{ref} g$, if (i) $\mathrm{dom}(f) = \mathrm{dom}(g)$ and (ii) $g(x) \subseteq f(x)$ (set inclusion) holds for every $x \in \mathrm{dom}(g)$ [8]. For any function classes $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$, the succinct notation $\mathcal{F} \sqsubseteq_{ref} \mathcal{G}$ is used to when every function in $\mathcal{F}$ has a refinement in $\mathcal{G}$.

Our mechanical model of computation is a *one-way nondeterministic pushdown automaton* (or an *npda*, in short) with/without a write-only output tape, allowing λ-moves (or λ-transitions). We use an infinite input tape, which holds two special endmarkers: the left endmarker ¢ and the right endmarker \$. Let $\check{\Sigma} = \Sigma \cup \{¢, \$\}$. In addition, we use a semi-infinite output tape, on which its tape head is initially positioned at the first (i.e., the leftmost) tape cell and moves only in one direction (to the right) whenever it writes a non-blank symbol. Formally, an npda M with an output tape is a tuple $(Q, \Sigma, \{¢, \$\}, \Gamma, \Theta, \delta, q_0, Z_0, Q_{acc}, Q_{rej})$ with a finite set Q of inner states, an input alphabet Σ, a stack alphabet Γ, an output alphabet Θ, the initial state $q_0 \in Q$, the bottom marker $Z_0 \in \Gamma$, a set Q_{acc} (resp., Q_{rej}) of accepting (resp., rejecting) states satisfying $Q_{halt} = Q_{acc} \cup Q_{rej} \subseteq Q$, and a transition function $\delta : (Q - Q_{halt}) \times (\check{\Sigma} \cup \{\lambda\}) \times \Gamma \to \mathcal{P}(Q \times \Gamma^* \times (\Theta \cup \{\lambda\}))$. The input tape is indexed by natural numbers with ¢ in the 0th cell. When an input $x = x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n$ of length n is given, it is placed in cells from 1 to n, where \$ is at the $(n+1)$th cell. A stack holds a series $s_k s_{k-1} \cdots s_1 s_0$ of stack symbols in such a way that $s_0 = Z_0$ and s_k is a topmost symbol. We demand that M should neither remove Z_0 nor replace it with any other symbol at any step; that is, for any tuple (p, q, s, σ, τ), $(p, s, \tau) \notin \delta(q, \sigma, Z_0)$ holds if s does not contain Z_0 at its bottom. Here, we say that the stack is *empty* if it contains only the bottom marker Z_0. Notice that, conventionally, M is not allowed to use Z_0 as an ordinary stack symbol. Furthermore, the output tape must be *write-only*; namely, whenever M writes a non-blank symbol on this tape, its tape head must move to the right. It is important to recognize two types of λ-move. When δ is applied to tuple (q, λ, γ), M modifies the current contents of its stack and its output tape while neither scanning input symbols nor moving its input-tape head. In contrast, when $(p, w, \lambda) \in \delta(q, \sigma, \gamma)$ holds, M neither moves its output-tape head nor writes any non-blank symbol onto the output tape.

A *configuration* of M on input x is a triplet (q, i, w), in which M is in state q (with $q \in Q$), its tape head scans the ith cell (with $i \in [0, |x|+1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$), and its stack contains w (with $w \in \Gamma^*$). The *initial configuration* is $(q_0, 0, Z_0)$ and an accepting (resp., a rejecting) configuration is a configuration with an accepting state (resp., a rejecting state). A *halting configuration* is either an accepting or a rejecting configuration. A *computation path* of M on x is a series of configurations of M on x, starting with the initial configuration and an co configuration must be reached from its predecessor by a single application of δ.

Whenever we need to discuss an *npda having no output tape*, we drop "Θ" as well as "$\Theta \cup \{\lambda\}$" from the above definition of M and δ. As stated in Section 1, we consider only npda's whose computation paths all terminate within $O(n)$ steps, where n refers to any input size, and this particular condition concerning the termination of computation is conventionally called the *termination condition* [13]. Throughout this paper, all npda's are implicitly assumed to satisfy this termination condition.

In general, an *output* (*outcome* or *output string*) of M along a given computation path refers to a string over Θ written down on the output tape when the computation path terminates. Such an output is called *valid* (or *legitimate*) if the corresponding computation path is an accepting computation path (i.e., M enters an accepting state along this path). We say that an npda M with an output tape *computes* function f if, on every input x, M produces exactly all the strings in $f(x)$ as valid outputs; namely, for every pair (x, y), $y \in f(x)$ if and only if y is a valid outcome of M on the input x. Notice that an npda can generally produce more than one valid output string, its computed function inherently becomes multi-valued. Because invalid outputs produced by M are all discarded from our arguments in the subsequent sections, we will refer to valid outputs as just "outputs" unless otherwise stated.

The notation CFLMV (resp., CFLkV for a fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$) stands for the class of multi-valued (resp., k-valued) partial functions that can be computed by appropriate npda's with write-only output tapes in linear time. When $k = 1$, we customarily write CFLSV instead of CFL1V. In addition, we define UCFLkV as the collection of all functions f in CFLkV for which a certain npda M with an output tape computes f with the extra condition (called the *unambiguous computation condition*) that, for every input x and every value y in $f(x)$, there exists exactly one accepting computation path of M on x producing y. It follows by their definitions that UCFLkV $\subseteq$ CFLkV $\subseteq$ CFLMV. Since any function producing exactly $k+1$ values cannot belong to CFLkV by definition, CFLkV $\neq$ CFL$(k+1)$V holds; thus, in particular,

[¶]Another expression $f : A \to B$ is customarily used in computational complexity to express a multi-valued partial function.

we obtain CFLSV $\neq$ CFLMV. Notice that this inequality does not directly lead to the desired conclusion CFLMV $\not\sqsubseteq_{ref}$ CFLSV.

To describe behaviors of an npda's stack, we closely follow terminology from [11, 15]. A *stack content* is formally a series $z_m z_{m-1} \cdots z_1 z_0$ of stack symbols sequentially stored into a stack (in our convention, z_0 is the bottom marker Z_0 and z_m is a symbol at the top of the stack). We sometimes refer to a stack content obtained just after the tape head scans and then moves off the ith cell of the input tape as a *stack content at the ith position*. A series of stack contents produced along a computation path is briefly referred to as a *stack history*.

3 Proof of the Main Theorem

Our ultimate goal is to solve negatively a question that was posed in [7] and reformulated in [14] as in the form of Question 1.1. For this purpose, we will prove the main theorem (Theorem 1.4). As an example of a no-refinable function for the theorem, we will present a special function, called h_3, which belongs to UCFL2V (shown in Section 3.1), and then give an explanation of why no refinement of this function is found in CFLSV, resulting in the main theorem, namely, UCFL2V $\not\sqsubseteq_{ref}$ CFLSV. To simplify our proof, we will introduce a model of colored automata, which have no output tapes but have "colors" to specify their outcomes (in Section 3.2). We will conduct a combinatorial analysis on a stack history of the colored automaton in Section 3.3–3.6.

3.1 An Example Function

Our example function h_3 is a natural extension of a well-known deterministic context-free language $\{x\#x^R \mid x \in \{0,1\}^*\}$ (marked even-length palindromes), where $\#$ is a distinguished symbol not in $\{0,1\}$. Let us define two supporting languages $L = \{x_1\#x_2\#x_3 \mid x_1, x_2, x_3 \in \{0,1\}^*\}$ and $L_3 = \{w \mid w = x_1\#x_2\#x_3 \in L, \exists (i,j) \in I_3\ [x_i^R = x_j]\}$, where $I_3 = \{(i,j) \mid i,j \in \mathbb{N}^+, 1 \leq i < j \leq 3\}$. We then introduce the desired function h_3 by setting $h_3(w) = \{0^i 1^j \mid (i,j) \in I_3, x_i^R = x_j\}$ if $w = x_1\#x_2\#x_3 \in L$, and $h_3(w) = \emptyset$ if w is not in L. It thus follows that $L_3 = \{w \in L \mid h_3(w) \neq \emptyset\}$. As simple examples, if w has the form $x\#x^R\#y$ with $x \neq y$, then $h_3(w)$ equals $\{01^2\}$; in contrast, if $w = x\#x^R\#x$, then $h_3(w)$ is $\{01^2, 0^2 1^3\}$.

Now, let us claim the following assertion.

Proposition 3.1 *The above function h_3 is in* UCFL2V.

Proof. Obviously, the function h_3 is 2-valued. Let us consider the following npda M equipped with a write-only output tape. On any input w, M deterministically checks whether w is of the form $x_1\#x_2\#x_3$ in L by moving its input-tape head from left to right by counting the number of $\#$ in w. At the same time, M guesses (i.e., nondeterministically chooses) a pair $(i,j) \in I_3$, writes $0^i 1^j$ onto its output tape, stores x_i into a stack, and then checks whether x_i^R matches x_j by retrieving x_i in a reverse order from the stack. If $x_i^R = x_j$ holds, then M enters an accepting state; otherwise, it enters a rejecting state.

To be more formal, we define the desired npda $M = (Q, \Sigma, \{\mathbin{\not\$}, \$\}, \Gamma, \Theta, \delta, q_0, Z_0, Q_{acc}, Q_{rej})$ as follows. Let $\Sigma = \{0,1,\#\}$, $\Gamma = \{0,1,Z_0\}$, and $\Theta = \{0,1\}$. Moreover, let $Q_{acc} = \{q_{acc}\}$ and $Q_{rej} = \{q_{rej}\}$. The transition function δ consists of the following transitions. The first move of M is a nondeterministic move of $\delta(q_0, \mathbin{\not\$}, Z_0) = \{(q_{12}^{(0)}, Z_0, 01^2), (q_{23}^{(0)}, Z_0, 0^2 1^3), (q_{13}^{(0)}, Z_0, 01^3)\}$. With respect to $q_{12}^{(0)}$, this first step is followed by a series of transitions: $\delta(q_{12}^{(0)}, \sigma, a) = \{(q_{12}^{(0)}, \sigma a, \lambda)\}$, $\delta(q_{12}^{(0)}, \#, a) = \{(q_{12}^{(1)}, a, \lambda)\}$, $\delta(q_{12}^{(1)}, \sigma, \sigma) = \{(q_{12}^{(1)}, \lambda, \lambda)\}$, $\delta(q_{12}^{(1)}, \#, Z_0) = \{(q_{12}^{(2)}, Z_0, \lambda)\}$, $\delta(q_{12}^{(2)}, \sigma, Z_0) = \{(q_{12}^{(2)}, Z_0, \lambda)\}$, and $\delta(q_{12}^{(2)}, \$, Z_0) = \{(q_{acc}, Z_0, \lambda)\}$, where $\sigma \in \Sigma$ and $a \in \Gamma$. For all other transitions, M changes its inner states to q_{rej}. For the other two states $q_{23}^{(0)}$ and $q_{13}^{(0)}$, we can define similar sets of transitions and thus we omit their precise descriptions.

It therefore follows by the above definition that, for each choice of (i,j) in I_3, there is at most one accepting computation path producing $0^i 1^j$. It is not difficult to show that M computes h_3. Therefore, h_3 belongs to UCFL2V. □

Now, we have an example function in UCFL2V. To complete the proof of the main theorem, it therefore suffices to verify the following proposition regarding the non-existence of a refinement of the function h_3.

Proposition 3.2 *The function h_3 has no refinement in* CFLSV.

In the next five subsections, we will describe the proof of Proposition 3.2 and thus verify the main theorem.

3.2 Colored Automata

Our proof of Proposition 3.2 proceeds by way of contradiction. To lead to the desired contradiction, we first assume that h_3 has a refinement, say, g in CFLSV. Since g is single-valued, we rather write $g(x) = y$ instead of $g(x) = \{y\}$ for $x \in \mathrm{dom}(f)$. Take an npda N computing g with a write-only output tape. Assume that N has the form $(Q, \Sigma, \{\mathrm{¢}, \$\}, \Gamma, \Theta, \delta, q_0, Z_0, Q_{acc}, Q_{rej})$ with a transition function $\delta : (Q - Q_{halt}) \times (\check{\Sigma} \cup \{\lambda\}) \times \Gamma \to \mathcal{P}(Q \times \Gamma^* \times (\Theta \cup \{\lambda\}))$. Notice that $\Sigma = \Theta = \{0, 1\}$ by the definition of g.

Unfortunately, we find it difficult to directly analyze the moves of N's output-tape head. To overcome this difficulty, we then try to modify N into a new variant of *npda having no output tape*, say, M. As seen later, this modification is possible because g's output values are limited to strings of constant lengths. Now, let us introduce this new machine, dubbed as "colored" automaton, which has no output tapes but uses "colored" stack symbols. Using a finite set C of "colors," a *colored automaton* $M = (Q', \Sigma, \{\mathrm{¢}, \$\}, \Gamma', C, \delta', q'_0, Z_0, Q'_{acc}, Q'_{rej})$ partitions its stack alphabet Γ', except for the bottom marker, into sets $\{\Gamma_\xi\}_{\xi \in C}$; namely, $\bigcup_{\xi \in C} \Gamma_\xi = \Gamma - \{Z_0\}$ and $\Gamma_\xi \cap \Gamma_{\xi'} = \emptyset$ for any distinct pair $\xi, \xi' \in C$. Let $\Gamma'_\xi = \Gamma_\xi \cup \{Z_0\}$ for each $\xi \in C$. We define a *color* of stack symbol γ to be ξ in C if γ is in Γ'_ξ. Note that Z_0 has $|C|$ colors. Given a color $\xi \in C$, we call a computation path of M a *ξ-computation path* if all configurations along this computation path use only stack symbols in color ξ. An *output* of M on input x is composed of all colors ξ in C for which there is an accepting ξ-computation path of M on x.

Here, we claim that the function g is computed also by an appropriately chosen colored automaton.

Lemma 3.3 *Assuming $g \in$ CFLSV, there exists a colored automaton M that computes g.*

Proof. Associated with the set I_3 introduced in Section 3.1, we define a new set $\bar{I}_3 = \{0^i 1^j \mid (i, j) \in I_3\}$ and another set $\bar{I}_3^{part}$ composed of all substrings of any string in $\bar{I}_3$. Recall the given npda N computing g with a write-only output tape. Now, we need to construct a new colored automaton $M = (Q', \Sigma, \{\mathrm{¢}, \$\}, \Gamma', \bar{I}_3, \delta', q'_0, Z_0, Q'_{acc}, Q'_{rej})$ that simulates N.

We start by setting $Q' = Q \times (\bar{I}_3 \cup \{\lambda\}) \times \bar{I}_3^{part}$ and $q'_0 = (q_0, \lambda, \lambda)$. In addition, let $\Gamma' = \{Z_0\} \cup \{\tau^{(t)} \mid \tau \in \Gamma - \{Z_0\}, t \in \bar{I}_3\}$. Intuitively, taking an input x, M first *guesses* (i.e., nondeterministically chooses) an output string t of $g(x)$. Note that, at the first step of M on input x, it always pushes a stack symbol. Whenever N pushes u to a stack along a specific computation path, M pushes its corresponding color-t symbol, say, $u^{(t)}$ into its stack. Further along this computation path, M keeps using only color-t stack symbols. Instead of having an output tape, M remembers the string produced on N's output tape. This is possible because t is of a constant length. Whenever N enters an accepting state q with an output string that matches the firstly guessed string t of M, M enters an appropriate accepting state, say, (q, t, t). In other cases, M rejects the input.

To realize this intuition, we formally define the transition function δ' as follows. Assume that N applies a transition of the form $(p, uZ_0, \xi) \in \delta(q, \mathrm{¢}, Z_0)$. The corresponding transition of M is $((p, t, \xi), u^{(t)}Z_0) \in \delta'(q'_0, \mathrm{¢}, Z_0)$ for all $t \in \bar{I}_3$. If, at a certain step, N is assumed to make a transition of the form $(p, w, \xi) \in \delta(q, \sigma, \gamma)$ with $\sigma \neq \mathrm{¢}$, then M applies $((p, t, \tau\xi), w^{(t)}) \in \delta'((q, t, \tau), \sigma, \gamma^{(t)})$, where $w^{(t)}$ is defined recursively to be $u^{(t)}$ if $w = u \in \Gamma$, and $u_1^{(t)}u_2^{(t)}$ if $w = u_1u_2$. In the end of computation, assume that $(p, w, \xi) \in \delta(q, \$, \gamma)$ with $p \in Q_{halt}$. If $p \in Q_{acc}$ and $t = \tau\xi$, then we set $((p, t, t), w^{(t)}) \in \delta'((q, t, \tau), \$, \gamma^{(t)})$. If $p \in Q_{rej}$, then we set $((p, t, \tau\xi), w^{(t)}) \in \delta'((q, t, \tau), \$, \gamma^{(t)})$. However, if $p \in Q_{acc}$ but $t \neq \tau\xi$, then we use the new symbol q'_{rej} and set $((q'_{rej}, t, \tau\xi), w^{(t)}) \in \delta'((q, t, \tau), \$, \gamma^{(t)}))$. Finally, we define $Q'_{acc} = \{(q, t, t) \mid q \in Q_{acc}, t \in \bar{I}_3\}$ and $Q'_{rej} = \{(q, t, s) \mid t \neq s, q \in Q_{rej} \cup \{q'_{rej}\}, t \in \bar{I}_3, s \in \bar{I}_3^{part}\}$. □

To simplify notation in our argument, we describe the colored automaton M guaranteed by Lemma 3.3 as $(Q, \Sigma, \{\mathrm{¢}, \$\}, \Gamma, I_3, \delta, q_0, Z_0, Q_{acc}, Q_{rej})$. Notice that we consciously use I_3 instead of $\bar{I}_3$. For the subsequent analysis of the behaviors of M, it is quite useful to restrict the "shape" of M. A colored automaton M is said to be *in an ideal shape* if M satisfies all of the following six conditions.

1. There are only one accepting state q_{acc} and one rejecting state q_{rej}. Moreover, the set Q of inner states equals $\{q_0, q, q_{acc}, q_{rej}\}$. The machine is always in state q during its computation except for the initial and final configurations.
2. An input-tape head always moves to the right until it reaches \$.
3. The machine never aborts its computation; that is, δ is a *total function* (i.e., $\delta(q, \sigma, \gamma) \neq \emptyset$ holds for any $(q, \sigma, \gamma) \in (Q - Q_{halt}) \times \check{\Sigma} \times \Gamma$).
4. The machine never enters any halting state before scanning the right endmarker \$.
5. Every stack operation either modifies a single topmost stack symbol or pushes extra one symbol onto the top of the stack after (possibly) altering the then-topmost symbol; that is, the range of δ must be

of the form $\mathcal{P}(Q \times \Gamma^{\leq 2} \times (\Theta \cup \{\lambda\}))$, where $\Gamma^{\leq k}$ is the set $\{\gamma \in \Gamma^* \mid |\gamma| \leq k\}$.

6. The stack never becomes empty at any step of the computation except for the initial and the final configurations. In addition, at the first step of reading ¢, the machine must push a stack symbol onto Z_0 and this stack symbol determines the stack color in the rest of its computation path. Before entering any halting state, the stack must become empty.

It is well-known that, for any context-free language L, there always exists an npda (with no output tape) in an ideal shape that recognizes L (see, e.g., [5]). Similarly, we can assert the following statement for colored automata.

Lemma 3.4 (Ideal Shape Lemma) *Given any colored automaton, there is always another colored automaton in an ideal shape that produces the same set of output values.*

For readability, we place the proof of Lemma 3.4 in Appendix.

In the rest of this section, we fix the colored automaton M, which computes g correctly. We further assume by Lemma 3.4 that M is in an ideal shape.

Hereafter, let us focus on inputs of the form $x\#x^R\#y$ for $x, y \in \{0,1\}^*$. For any string $x \in \{0,1\}^*$, we abbreviate the set $\{y \in \{0,1\}^{|x|} \mid y \notin \{x, x^R\}\}$ as H_x. Given a number $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, $D^{(n)}_{(i,j)}$ denotes the set of all strings $x \in \{0,1\}^n$ for which there exists an accepting (i,j)-computation path of M on input $x\#x^R\#x$. Since g is single-valued, it follows that $D^{(n)}_{(1,2)} \cup D^{(n)}_{(2,3)} = \{0,1\}^n$. We therefore conclude that, for every length n, either $|D^{(n)}_{(1,2)}| \geq 2^n/2$ or $|D^{(n)}_{(2,3)}| \geq 2^n/2$ holds. We will discuss in Section 3.3 the case where $|D^{(n)}_{(2,3)}| \geq 2^n/2$ holds for infinitely many n's and consider in Section 3.6 the case where $|D^{(n)}_{(2,3)}| \geq 2^n/2$ holds only finitely many n's (thus, $|D^{(n)}_{(1,2)}| \geq 2^n/2$ holds for infinitely many n's). To complete the proof of Proposition 3.2, it suffices for us to obtain a contradiction in both cases.

3.3 Case 1: $D_{(2,3)}$ is Large for Infinite Lengths

Let us first consider the case where the inequality $|D^{(n)}_{(2,3)}| \geq 2^n/2$ holds for infinitely many lengths $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Take an arbitrary number $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that is significantly larger than $3^{|Q|+|\Sigma|+|\Gamma|}$ and also satisfies $|D^{(n)}_{(2,3)}| \geq 2^n/2$. We fix such a number n throughout our proof and we thus tend to drop script "n" whenever its omission is clear from the context; for instance, we intend to write $D_{(2,3)}$ instead of $D^{(n)}_{(2,3)}$.

By the property of the colored automaton M computing g, it follows that, for any pair $x, y \in \{0,1\}^n$, if $y \notin \{x, x^R\}$, then, on input $x\#x^R\#y$, there always exists a certain accepting $(1,2)$-computation path of M; however, since g is single-valued, there must be no *accepting* $(1,2)$-computation path of M on input $x\#x^R\#x$ for every x in $D_{(2,3)}$. In addition, no accepting $(1,2)$-computation path exists on input $x\#z\#y$ if $z \neq x^R$. Since there could be a large number of accepting $(1,2)$-computation paths of M on $x\#x^R\#y$, we need to choose one of them arbitrarily and take a close look at this particular computation path.

For the above purpose, we denote by $PATH_n$ the set of all possible *accepting* $(1,2)$-computation paths of M on inputs of the form $x\#x^R\#y$ for any two strings $x, y \in \{0,1\}^n$, and we fix a *partial assignment* $\pi : D_{(2,3)} \times \{0,1\}^n \to PATH_n$ that, for any element (x,y), if $y \in H_x$, then π picks one of the accepting $(1,2)$-computation paths of M on input $x\#x^R\#y$; otherwise, let $\pi(x,y)$ be *undefined*, for simplicity. Hereafter, we abbreviate $\pi(x,y)$ as $p_{x,y}$. Note that $p_{x,y}$ is uniquely determined from (x,y) whenever $\pi(x,y)$ is defined.

Given an accepting $(1,2)$-computation path $p_{x,y}$ of M on input $x\#x^R\#y$, the notation $\gamma^{(x)}_{i,y}$ is used to denote a stack content obtained by M just after reading off the first i symbols of $x\#x^R\#y$ along the computation path $p_{x,y}$. For convenience, we abbreviate as $\gamma^{(x)}_y$ the stack content $\gamma^{(x)}_{|x\#x^R\#|,y}$, which is produced by M just after reading $x\#x^R\#$ of the input $x\#x^R\#y$. Note that, for each $x \in D_{(2,3)}$ and any $y \in H_x$, along an accepting $(1,2)$-computation path $p_{x,y}$ on input $x\#x^R\#y$, M produces unique stack contents $\gamma^{(x)}_{|x\#|,y}$ and $\gamma^{(x)}_y$.

In Sections 3.4–3.6, we plan to evaluate how many strings x in $D_{(2,3)}$ satisfy each of the following conditions.

1. Strings x make $\gamma^{(x)}_y$ small in size for all $y \in H_x$.
2. Strings x make $\gamma^{(x)}_y$ relatively large in size for certain strings $y \in H_x$.

Proposition 3.7 gives a lower bound on the number of strings satisfying Condition (1), whereas Propositions 3.13 and 3.16 provide lower bounds on the number of strings for Condition (2). If these two bounds

are large enough, then they guarantee the existence of a string that meet both conditions, clearly leading to a contradiction. Therefore, we conclude that M cannot exist, closing Case 1. Proposition 3.7 will be verified in Section 3.4 and Propositions 3.13 and 3.16 will appear in Section 3.5.

3.4 Fundamental Properties of a Stack History

A key to our proof is an analysis of a stack history of the given colored automaton M. In the following series of lemmas and a proposition, we will explore fundamental properties of a stack history of M along accepting $(1,2)$-computation path $p_{x,y}$ on input of the form $x\#x^R\#y$. Those properties are essential in proving the main theorem. We start with a simple property, of which the same stack content does not appear again in this stack history.

Lemma 3.5 *Fix $x \in D_{(2,3)}$ and $y \in \{0,1\}^n$ arbitrarily. For any accepting $(1,2)$-computation path $p_{x,y}$ of M on input $x\#x^R\#y$, there is no pair (i_1,i_2) of positions such that $|x| < i_1 < i_2 \leq |x\#x^R\#|$ and $\gamma^{(x)}_{i_1,y} = \gamma^{(x)}_{i_2,y}$. Moreover, the same statement is true when $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq |x|$.*

Proof. Assume that M has an accepting $(1,2)$-computation path $p_{x,y}$. If the lemma fails, then $\gamma^{(x)}_{i_1,y} = \gamma^{(x)}_{i_2,y}$ must hold for a certain pair (i_1,i_2) satisfying $|x| < i_1 < i_2 \leq |x\#x^R\#|$. We remove all symbols between positions i_1+1 and i_2 from $x\#x^R\#y$ and then express the resulted string by $x\#x'\#y$. Since $\gamma^{(x)}_{i_1,y} = \gamma^{(x)}_{i_2,y}$, we can obtain a new $(1,2)$-computation path, along which M still enters an accepting state on input $x\#x'\#y$. However, since $x' \neq x^R$, there must be no accepting $(1,2)$-computation path on $x\#x'\#y$, a contradiction. The second part of the lemma follows by a similar argument. □

Lemma 3.5 can be generalized as follows.

Lemma 3.6 *Let $x_1,x_2,y_1,y_2 \in \{0,1\}^n$ with $y_1 \in H_{x_1}$ and $y_2 \in H_{x_2}$, $i_1,i_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $1 \leq i_1,i_2 \leq |x_1\#x_1^R\#|$. Assume that one of the following three conditions holds: (i) $i_1 \neq i_2$, (ii) $1 \leq i_1 = i_2 \leq |x_1\#|$ and $(x_1)_{i_1} \neq (x_2)_{i_2}$, and (iii) $(x_1)_{|x_1\#|} = (x_2)_{|x_1\#|}$, $|x_1\#| < i_1 = i_2 \leq |x_1\#x_1^R\#|$, and $(x_1)_{i_1} \neq (x_2)_{i_2}$. If p_{x_1,y_1} and p_{x_2,y_2} exist, then $\gamma^{(x_1)}_{i_1,y_1} \neq \gamma^{(x_2)}_{i_2,y_2}$ follows.*

Proof. The first case of $i_1 \neq i_2$ comes from an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 3.5. In what follows, we therefore assume that $i_1 = i_2$ and denote them as i for simplicity. Next, we consider the second case where $1 \leq i \leq |x_1\#|$ and $(x_1)_i \neq (x_2)_i$. Toward a contradiction, we now assume that $\gamma^{(x_1)}_{i,y_1} = \gamma^{(x_2)}_{i,y_2}$. Assume that there are two accepting $(1,2)$-computation paths p_{x_1,y_1} and p_{x_2,y_2} generated by M respectively on inputs $x_1\#x_1^R\#y_1$ and $x_2\#x_2^R\#y_2$. Since $\gamma^{(x_1)}_{i,y_1} = \gamma^{(x_2)}_{i,y_2}$ by our assumption, we can swap the initial segments of these two computation paths restricted to the first i steps, corresponding to the first i bits of the two inputs. Take a string u_1 satisfying $x_1 = (x_1)_i u_1$. As a result, we obtain another accepting $(1,2)$-computation path on input $(x_2)_i u_1\#x_1^R\#y_1$. We thus conclude that $(x_2)_i u_1 = x_1$. On the contrary, $(x_1)_i \neq (x_2)_i$ implies $(x_2)_i u_1 \neq x_1$. This is a clear contradiction.

A similar argument can handle the third case, in which $|x_1\#| < i \leq |x_1\#x_1^R\#|$, $(x_1)_{|x_1\#|} = (x_2)_{|x_2\#|}$, and $(x_1)_i \neq (x_2)_i$ hold. Note that i is different from $|x_1\#x_1^R\#|$ since $(x_1)_{\ell-i_1} \neq (x_2)_{\ell-i_2}$, where $\ell = |x_1\#x_1^R\#|$. □

Here, we want to estimate the number of strings x in $D_{(2,3)}$ for which their corresponding stack contents $\gamma^{(x)}_y$ are small in size for an *arbitrary* string y in H_x. In what follows, we will give its lower bound, which is sufficiently large for our purpose.

Proposition 3.7 *There exist two constants $d_1,d_2 \in \mathbb{N}^+$, independent of (n,x,y), such that $|\{x \in D_{(2,3)} \mid \forall y \in H_x\,[|\gamma^{(x)}_y| < d_1]\}| \geq |D_{(2,3)}| - d_2$.*

For the proof of Proposition 3.7, we need two supporting lemmas, Lemmas 3.8 and 3.9. To explain these lemmas, we need to introduce extra terminology and notation.

Recall that $\{\Gamma_t\}_{y \in I_3}$ is a "color" partition of Γ. Given two strings $u,v \in (\Gamma_{(1,2)})^*$ and a string $z \in \{0,1\}^*$, we say that *M transforms u to v while reading z (along computation (sub)path p)* if M behaves as follows along this computation (sub)path p: (i) M starts in state q with uZ_0 in its stack, scanning the leftmost input symbol of z, (ii) M then reads z, with no endmarkers, from the input tape, (iii) just after reading off z, M enters state q with vZ_0 in the stack, and (iv) M does not empty the stack (except for Z_0) while reading z. The notation $TF_M(u,v)$ expresses the set of all strings of the form $z\#z'$ for any pair $z,z' \in \{0,1\}^*$ such that M transforms u to v while reading $z\#z'$ along certain computation (sub)paths.

Lemma 3.8 *Given any pair $u, v \in (\Gamma_{(1,2)})^*$, there is at most one string x' such that x' is a substring of a certain string x in $D_{(2,3)}$ and M transforms u to v while reading x' along an appropriate subpath of $p_{x,y}$ for a certain $y \in \{0,1\}^n$.*

Proof. We will prove the lemma by way of contradiction. Assume that there are two distinct strings $x_1, x_2 \in \{0,1\}^*$ satisfying that M transforms u to v while reading x_1 along computation subpath p_1 and M transforms u to v while reading x_2 along computation subpath p_2. Let us consider $x \in D_{(2,3)}$ such that x contains x_1 as a substring and an accepting $(1,2)$-computation path $p_{x,y}$ on input $x\#x^R\#y$ contains p_1 as a subpath. Let x' be a string obtained from x by replacing x_1 with x_2. It is thus possible to swap the two subpaths p_1 and p_2 without changing the acceptance criteria of M. Therefore, M must have an accepting $(1,2)$-computation path on $x'\#x^R\#y$. This is absurd since $x' \neq x$. □

Next, we will show a technical lemma, Lemma 3.9, which is essential to prove Proposition 3.7. We already know from Lemma 3.6 that all elements in $\{\gamma_{i,y}^{(x)} \mid 1 \leq i \leq |x\#x^R\#|\}$ are mutually distinct. Here, we are focused particularly on stack contents $\gamma_{i,y}^{(x)}$ of minimal size. Given any pair (x,y), we define $MSC_{x,y}$ (minimal stack contents) to be a collection of all stack contents γ that meet the following requirement: there exists a tape position ℓ with $|x\#| \leq \ell \leq |x\#x^R\#|$ such that (i) $\gamma = \gamma_{\ell,y}^{(x)}$ and (ii) $|\gamma| \leq |\gamma_{\ell',y}^{(x)}|$ holds for any position ℓ' satisfying $|x\#| \leq \ell' \leq |x\#x^R\#|$. Condition (ii), in particular, ensures that the size of γ must be minimum. Note that $MSC_{x,y}$ cannot be empty.

Lemma 3.9 roughly states that, if there is an interval between 1 and $|x\#x^R\#|$ crossing over the first # in which M transforms a stack symbol τ to another σ, the size of stack content is small at the $|x\#x^R\#|$-th position.

Lemma 3.9 *There exists a constant $d > 0$, independent of (n,x,y), that satisfies the following statement. Let $x \in D_{(2,3)}$, $y \in H_x$, and $\gamma_{\ell,y}^{(x)} \in MSC_{x,y}$ with $|x\#| \leq \ell \leq |x\#x^R\#|$. Moreover, let $x = rz$, $x^R = z^R sr'$, $\ell = |x\#z^R s|$, $\gamma_{|r|,y}^{(x)} = \tau v Z_0$, and $\gamma_{\ell,y}^{(x)} = \sigma v Z_0$ for an appropriate tuple $(r,r',z,s,\sigma,\tau,u,v)$. If $\ell \neq |x\#|$ and $z\#z^R s \in TF_M(\tau,\sigma)$, then $|\gamma_y^{(x)}| \leq d$ holds. Moreover, when n is sufficiently large, $\ell \neq |x\#|$ also holds.*

Using Lemma 3.9, we can prove Proposition 3.7 in the following manner. Since $MSC_{x,y}$ is non-empty, we can take an element $\gamma_{\ell,y}^{(x)}$ from $MSC_{x,y}$ satisfying $|x\#| \leq \ell \leq |x\#x^R\#|$. By the size-minimality of $\gamma_{\ell,y}^{(x)}$, it follows that $|\gamma_{i,y}^{(x)}| \geq |\gamma_{\ell,y}^{(x)}|$ for any i with $|x\#| \leq i \leq \ell$. Thus, there must be a position i satisfying both $1 \leq i \leq |x\#|$ and $|\gamma_{i,y}^{(x)}| = |\gamma_{\ell,y}^{(x)}|$. This indicates that, by choosing an appropriate tuple $(r,r',z,s,\sigma,\tau,u,v)$, we can decompose $x\#x^R\#y$ into

(*) $x = rz$, $x^R = z^R sr'$, $\ell = |x\#z^R s|$, $\gamma_y^{(x)} = uvZ_0$, $\gamma_{|r|,y}^{(x)} = \tau v Z_0$, $\gamma_{\ell,y}^{(x)} = \sigma v Z_0$, and $z\#z^R s \in TF_M(\tau,\sigma)$.

The second part of Lemma 3.9 implies that, except for a finite number of x's, $\ell \neq |x\#|$ always holds. Define d_2 to be the total number of those exceptional x's. For the other x's, since $\ell \neq |x\#|$, the first part of Lemma 3.9 provides the desired constant d_1 that upper-bounds $|\gamma_y^{(x)}|$. We therefore obtain the proposition.

Now, it is time to verify Lemma 3.9. This lemma requires two additional lemmas, Lemmas 3.10 and 3.11. In the first lemma given below, we want to show that the size of s in (*) is bounded from above by a certain absolute constant.

Lemma 3.10 *There exists a constant $d_1 > 0$, independent of (n,x,y), satisfying the following statement. Let $x \in D_{(2,3)}$, $y \in H_x$, and $\gamma_{\ell,y}^{(x)} \in MSC_{x,y}$ with $|x\#| \leq \ell \leq |x\#x^R\#|$. Moreover, let $x = rz$, $x^R = z^R sr'$, $\ell = |x\#z^R s|$, $\gamma_{|r|,y}^{(x)} = \tau v Z_0$, and $\gamma_{\ell,y}^{(x)} = \sigma v Z_0$. If $\ell \neq |x\#|$ and $z\#z^R s \in TF_M(\tau,\sigma)$, then $|s| \leq d_1$ holds.*

Proof. Let $(r,r',z,s,\sigma,\tau,u,v)$ satisfy that $x = rz$, $x^R = z^R sr'$, $\ell = |x\#z^R s|$, $\gamma_{|r|,y}^{(x)} = \tau v Z_0$, and $\gamma_{\ell,y}^{(x)} = \sigma v Z_0$. Moreover, we assume that $\ell \neq |x\#|$ and $z\#z^R s$ belongs to $TF_M(\tau,\sigma)$. From $\ell \neq |x\#|$, it follows that $z \neq \lambda$. Let us assume further that $\gamma_{\ell,y}^{(x)} \in MSC_{x,y}$. We first claim that the string s can be uniquely determined from the pair (τ,σ).

Claim 1 *Let $z_1 \in \{0,1\}^+$ and $s_1 \in \{0,1\}^*$ be arbitrary strings. If $z_1\#z_1^R s_1 \in TF_M(\tau,\sigma)$, then $s = s_1$ holds.*

Let us prove this claim. Toward a contradiction, we assume that $s \neq s_1$. Let p_1 be an accepting $(1,2)$-computation path generated by M while reading $rz\#z^R sr'$. Consider its computation subpath, say,

p_2 associated with input $z\#z^Rs$. By our assumption of $z_1\#z_1^Rs_1 \in TF_M(\tau,\sigma)$, there exists a computation subpath, say, p_3 corresponding to $z_1\#z_1^Rs_1$. Now, along the computation path p_1, we replace the subpath p_2 by p_3. We then obtain a new accepting $(1,2)$-computation path on input $rz_1\#z_1^Rs_1r'$. Thus, we conclude that $(rz_1)^R = z_1^Rr^R = z_1^Rsr' \neq z_1^Rs_1r'$ because of $s \neq s_1$. This means that there is no accepting $(1,2)$-computation path on $rz_1\#z_1^Rs_1r'$, a contradiction. Therefore, Claim 1 must be true.

Claim 1 associates uniquely s with (τ,σ), and thus we can define a map from (τ,σ) to s. Hence, the number of all possible strings s is at most $|\Gamma'_{(1,2)}|^2$, which is a constant. From this fact, we can draw a conclusion that $|s|$ is upper-bounded by an appropriately chosen constant, independent of (n,x,y). □

In the second lemma below, we want to show that the size of r' in (*) is also upper-bounded by a certain absolute constant.

Lemma 3.11 *There exists a constant $d_2 > 0$, independent of (n,x,y), that satisfies the following statement. Let $x \in D_{(2,3)}$, $y \in H_x$, and $\gamma^{(x)}_{\ell,y} \in MSC_{x,y}$. Moreover, let $x = rz$, $x^R = z^Rsr'$, $y = r''z'$, $\ell = |x\#z^Rs|$, $\ell' = |x\#x^R\#r''|$, $\gamma^{(x)}_{|r|,y} = \tau vZ_0$, $\gamma^{(x)}_{\ell,y} = \sigma vZ_0$, and $\gamma^{(x)}_{\ell',y} = vZ_0$. If $r'\#r'' \in TF_M(\sigma,\lambda)$, then $|r'| \leq d_2$ holds.*

Proof. Take $r, r', r'', z, z', u, \tau, \sigma, \ell, \ell'$ as specified in the premise of the lemma and assume that $r'\#r'' \in TF_M(\sigma,\lambda)$. Similarly to Claim 1, we claim that σ uniquely determines r'.

Claim 2 *Let $r'_1, r''_1 \in \{0,1\}^*$. If $r'_1\#r''_1 \in TF_M(\sigma,\lambda)$, then $r'_1 = r'$.*

Claim 2 can be proven by way of contradiction. First, we assume that $r'_1 \neq r'$. Since $y \in H_x$, let us consider an accepting $(1,2)$-computation path $p_{x,y}$. We replace its portion associated with $r'\#r''$ by a path generated by M while reading $r'_1\#r''_1$. We then obtain another accepting $(1,2)$-computation path on input $rz\#z^Rsr'_1\#r''_1z'$. By the definition of h_3 and the choice of M, $(rz)^R = z^Rsr_1$ must hold. However, we obtain $(rz)^R \neq z^Rsr'_1$ from $r'_1 \neq r'$. This is a contradiction.

By Claim 2, we can define a map from σ to r'. This mapping implies that the number of all possible r' is at most $|\Gamma'_{(1,2)}|$. Therefore, $|r'|$ is bounded from above by a certain constant, independent of (n,x,y). □

Finally, we are ready to prove Lemma 3.9 with the help of Lemmas 3.10 and 3.11.

Proof of Lemma 3.9. Let $x = rz$ and $x^R = z^Rsr'$. Let $\gamma^{(x)}_y = uvZ_0$, $\gamma^{(x)}_\ell = \sigma vZ_0$ with $\ell = |x\#z^Rs|$. Assume that M transforms σ to u while reading r'. We first claim that $\ell \neq |x\#|$. Assume otherwise; namely, $\ell = |x\#|$. This assumption yields $z = s = \lambda$, which implies that $x^R = z^Rsr' = r'$. By Lemma 3.11, we obtain a constant size-upper bound of r'; in other words, there exists a constant d_2, independent of (n,x,y), satisfying $|r'| \leq d_2$. Since x is sufficiently large in size, r' must be large in size as well. This is a contradiction. Therefore, $\ell \neq |x\#|$ holds.

Lemma 3.10 further ensures the existence of an appropriate constant d_1 for which $|s| \leq d_1$. Lemma 3.11 also shows that $|r'|$ is upper-bounded by a certain constant, say, d_2. Since $|r| = |sr'| = |s| + |r'|$ by definition, $|r|$ is bounded from above by $d_1 + d_2$. Let σ_0 be the stack symbol pushed into the stack at the first step of M. Since M transforms σ_0 to τv while reading r for a certain stack symbol τ and the stack increases by at most one, it follows that $|v|$ (and therefore $|uvZ_0|$) is upper-bounded by a certain absolute constant. □

In the subsequent argument, the notation E_x expresses a collection of all stack contents $\gamma^{(x)}_y$ at the $|x\#x^R\#|$-th position (i.e., just after reading off $x\#x^R\#$) along an accepting $(1,2)$-computation path $p_{x,y}$ of M on input $x\#x^R\#y$ for each string $y \in H_x$. Since π is fixed, it follows that $1 \leq |E_x| \leq |H_x| = 2^{|x|} - 2$ because there are at most $|H_x|$ subpaths generated by M while reading inputs $x\#x^R\#y$ with $y \in H_x$.

Here, we prove a useful lemma, which will be used in Section 3.5.

Lemma 3.12 *Let $x_1, x_2, y \in \{0,1\}^n$ with $x_2 \in H_{x_1}$ and $y \in H_{x_2}$. If $x_2 \in D_{(2,3)}$ and $x_1 \neq x_2$, then there is no position i such that $|x_1| \leq i \leq |x_1\#x_1^R\#|$ and $\gamma^{(x_1)}_{i,x_2} = \gamma^{(x_2)}_{i,y}$.*

Proof. Assume that $x_2 \in D_{(2,3)}$ and $x_1 \neq x_2$. To lead to a contradiction, we further assume that a position i in the lemma actually exists. Now, we consider two accepting $(1,2)$-computation paths p_{x_1,x_2} and $p_{x_2,y}$. Let $j = |x_1\#x_1^R\#| - i$. Since $\gamma^{(x_1)}_{i,x_2} = \gamma^{(x_2)}_{i,y}$, it is possible to swap between subpaths of p_{x_1,x_2} and $p_{x_2,y}$ generated by M while reading substrings $x_1\#(x_1^R)_j$ and $x_2\#(x_2^R)_j$, respectively. We then obtain another accepting $(1,2)$-computation path, say, p on input $x_2\#(x_2^R)_j(x_1^R)_{n-j}\#x_2$. Here, we will examine two possible cases.

(Case i) If $(x_2^R)_j(x_1^R)_{n-j} \neq x_2^R$, then the computation path p cannot be an accepting $(1,2)$-computation path, a contradiction.

(Case ii) If $(x_2^R)_j(x_1^R)_{n-j} = x_2^R$, then $x_2\#(x_2^R)_j(x_1^R)_{n-j}\#x_2$ equals $x_2\#x_2^R\#x_2$. The obtained computation path p is indeed an accepting $(1,2)$-computation path on $x_2\#x_2^R\#x_2$ and thus x_2 must be in $D_{(1,2)}$. This obviously contradicts the choice of $x_2 \in D_{(2,3)}$, a contradiction. □

3.5 Size of Stack Contents

We continue our discussion on Case 1. In Proposition 3.7, we have shown that all but finitely many strings x in $D_{(2,3)}$ satisfy the inequality $|\gamma_y^{(x)}| < d_1$ for all $y \in H_x$. Toward an intended contradiction, we will further show that there are a large portion of x's in $D_{(2,3)}$ whose corresponding stack contents $\gamma_y^{(x)}$ for certain y's are large in size. Together with Proposition 3.7, we can derive a contradiction.

Let us recall the definition of E_x from Section 3.4. Notice that $1 \leq |E_x| \leq 2^{|x|} - 2$ holds for all strings x in $D_{(2,3)}$. Prior to a discussion on a general case of $|E_x| \geq 1$, we intend to consider a special case where $|E_x| = 1$ holds for any string $x \in D_{(2,3)}$, because this case exemplifies an essence of our proof for the general case.

I) Special Case of $|E_x| = 1$. Since $|E_x| = 1$, the choice of $y \in H_x$ becomes irrelevant. It is thus possible to drop subscript "y" altogether and abbreviate $\gamma_{i,y}^{(x)}$, $\gamma_y^{(x)}$, and $u_{x,y}$, for example, as $\gamma_i^{(x)}$, $\gamma^{(x)}$, and u_x, respectively. To lead to the desired contradiction, we want to show in Proposition 3.13 that a large number of strings $x \in D_{(2,3)}$ produce stack contents $\gamma_y^{(x)}$ of extremely large size for certain $y \in H_x$. Now, recall the set $\Gamma'_{(1,2)} = \Gamma_{(1,2)} \cup \{Z_0\}$.

Proposition 3.13 *Given any number $\epsilon \geq 0$, it holds that $|\{x \in D_{(2,3)} \mid \exists y \in H_x\, [|\gamma_y^{(x)}| \geq (n-2-\epsilon)/\log|\Gamma'_{(1,2)}|]\}| \geq |D_{(2,3)}|(1-2^{-\epsilon})$.*

To prove Proposition 3.13, let us consider two stack contents $\gamma_{x_2}^{(x_1)}$ and $\gamma_{x_1}^{(x_2)}$ for any distinct pair $x_1, x_2 \in D_{(2,3)}$. Lemma 3.12 implies that $\gamma_{x_2}^{(x_1)} \neq \gamma_{x_1}^{(x_2)}$ by choosing $i = |x_1\#x_1^R\#|$. We thus reach the following conclusion.

Lemma 3.14 *For every distinct pair $x_1, x_2 \in D_{(2,3)}$, it holds that $\gamma^{(x_1)} \neq \gamma^{(x_2)}$.*

To simplify our notation further, we write A_d to express the set $\{x \in D_{(2,3)} \mid \exists y \in H_x\, [|\gamma_y^{(x)}| \geq d]\}$ for each number $d \in \mathbb{N}^+$. With this notation, Proposition 3.13 is equivalent to $|A_{(n-2-\varepsilon)/\log|\Gamma'_{(1,2)}|}| \geq |D_{(2,3)}|(1-2^{-\varepsilon})$. Associated with A_d, we define $B_d = \{x \in D_{(2,3)} \mid \forall y \in H_x\, [|\gamma_y^{(x)}| < d]\}$. Note that $D_{(2,3)} = A_d \cup B_d$ holds for any number $d \in \mathbb{N}^+$. In the next lemma, we give a lower bound on the cardinality of A_d.

Lemma 3.15 *For any constant $d \in \mathbb{N}^+$, it holds that $|A_d| \geq |D_{(2,3)}| - 2|\Gamma'_{(1,2)}|^d$.*

Proof. Since $D_{(2,3)} = A_d \cup B_d$, it follows that $|A_d| = |D_{(2,3)}| - |B_d|$. Thus, we should concentrate on B_d. From $|E_x| = 1$, B_d coincides with $\{x \in D_{(2,3)} \mid |\gamma^{(x)}| < d\}$. Notice that each $\gamma^{(x)}$ belongs to $(\Gamma'_{(1,2)})^m$ for a certain number m with $m \leq d-1$. Consider a mapping h from x to $\gamma^{(x)}$. Induced from B_d, we define $\bar{B}_d = \{x \in B_d \mid x^R = x\}$. The function h is 1-to-1 on $\bar{B}_d$ and, by Lemma 3.14, it is also 1-to-1 on at least a half of elements in $B_d - \bar{B}_d$. Hence, it follows that $|B_d|/2 \leq \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} |\Gamma'_{(1,2)}|^j = |\Gamma'_{(1,2)}|^d$. We conclude that $|A_d| = |D_{(2,3)}| - |B_d| \geq |D_{(2,3)}| - 2|\Gamma'_{(2,3)}|^d$, as requested. □

With the help of Lemma 3.15, Proposition 3.13 is now easy to prove.

Proof of Proposition 3.13. For simplicity, we use d to denote $(n-2-\epsilon)/\log|\Gamma'_{(1,2)}|$, which equals $\log_{|\Gamma'_{(1,2)}|} 2^{n-2-\epsilon}$. Our goal is to show that $|A_d| \geq |D_{(2,3)}|(1-2^{-\epsilon})$. By Lemma 3.15, we obtain $|A_d| \geq |D_{(2,3)}| - 2|\Gamma'_{(1,2)}|^d$. Notice that, by the definition, $|\Gamma'_{(1,2)}|^d = 2^{n-2-\varepsilon} \leq |D_{(2,3)}| \cdot 2^{-1-\varepsilon}$, where the last inequality comes from our assumption of $|D_{(2,3)}| \geq 2^n/2$. As a result, we obtain $|A_d| \geq |D_{(2,3)}| - 2|\Gamma'_{(1,2)}|^d \geq |D_{(2,3)}|(1-2^{-\epsilon})$, as requested. □

To finish the special case, let $x = rz$, $x^R = z^R s r'$, $\gamma^{(x)} = uvZ_0$, and $\gamma_\ell^{(x)} = \sigma v Z_0$ with $\ell = |x\#z^R s|$. Assume that M transforms σ to u while reading r'. Proposition 3.7 shows that, for most of x's, $|uvZ_0|$ is

upper-bounded by a certain constant, independent of (n, x, y). However, by setting, e.g., $\epsilon = 98$, Proposition 3.13 yields $|uvZ_0| \geq (n - 100)/\log|\Gamma'_{(1,2)}|$ for at least the 2/3-fraction of x's in $D_{(2,3)}$. Since n is sufficiently large, $|uvZ_0|$ cannot be bounded from above by any absolute constant. Therefore, we obtain a clear contradiction.

II) General Case of $|E_x| \geq 1$. We have already shown how to deal with the case of $|E_x| = 1$ for all strings $x \in D_{(2,3)}$. Here, we will discuss a general case where $|E_x| \geq 1$ holds for any $x \in D_{(2,3)}$. Our goal is to prove the correctness of the following statement.

Proposition 3.16 *Let $d > 0$. All but $2|\Gamma|^d$ strings x in $D_{(2,3)}$ satisfy that, for a certain stack content $\tau \in E_x$, τ contains at least d symbols; namely, $|\{x \in D_{(2,3)} \mid \exists \tau \in E_x\, [|\tau| \geq d]\}| \geq |D_{(2,3)}| - 2|\Gamma|^d$.*

We start the proof of Proposition 3.16. We first need the following lemma, which is a generalization of Lemma 3.14.

Lemma 3.17 *Let $x_1, x_2 \in D_{(2,3)}$. If $x_1 \in H_{x_2}$, then $\gamma_{y_1}^{(x_1)} \neq \gamma_{x_1}^{(x_2)}$ for any $y_1 \in H_{x_1}$.*

Proof. Let $x_1, x_2 \in D_{(2,3)}$ and assume that $x_1 \in H_{x_2}$. Let $y_1 \in H_{x_1}$ be any string. To lead to a contradiction, we assume that $\gamma_{y_1}^{(x_1)} = \gamma_{x_1}^{(x_2)}$. Notice that $x_1 \neq x_2$ because of $x_1 \in H_{x_2}$. Consider $(1,2)$-computation paths p_{x_1,y_1} and p_{x_2,x_1} of M on $x_1\#x_1^R\#y_1$ and $x_2\#x_2^R\#x_1$, respectively. Construct a computation path, say, q_{x_1,x_1} of M on input $x_1\#x_1^R\#x_1$ by following p_{x_1,y_1} while reading $x_1\#x_1^R\#$ and then following any of M's computation paths while reading x_1. Along such a computation path q_{x_1,x_1}, M must enter a rejecting state because $x_1 \in D_{(2,3)}$ and the obtained path uses color $(1,2)$.

Let us consider the computation path p_{x_2,x_1}. Since $\gamma_{y_1}^{(x_1)} = \gamma_{x_1}^{(x_2)}$, we can replace a subpath of p_{x_2,x_1} associated with x_1 by any subpath of q_{x_1,x_1} associated with the last x_1. The computation paths that we obtain by this replacement are all rejecting paths. Since we consider all possible subpaths producible by M while reading the last x_1, the computation path p_{x_2,x_1} must be also a rejecting path. This is a contradiction. □

Let us return to the proof of Proposition 3.16. To simplify our notation, let $U_d = \{x \in D_{(2,3)} \mid \exists y \in E_x\, [|\gamma_y^{(x)}| \geq d]\}$ and define $X_d = \{x \in D_{(2,3)} \mid \forall y \in E_x\, [|\gamma_y^{(x)}| < d]\}$. Notice that $D_{(2,3)} = U_d \cup X_d$. We further set $\mathcal{E} = \bigcup_{x \in X_d} E_x$. Here, we aim at showing that $|X_d| \leq |\Gamma|^d$ by way of contradiction. Assuming of $|X_d| > |\Gamma|^d$, for each $x \in X_n$, we obtain $|\gamma_y^{(x)}| < d$ for all strings $y \in E_x$. This implies that $\bigcup_{x \in X_d} E_x \subseteq \Gamma^{<d}$, where $\Gamma^{<d}$ is the set of all strings over Γ of length $< d$. Therefore, we obtain $|\mathcal{E}| = |\bigcup_{x \in X_d} E_x| \leq \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} |\Gamma|^i = |\Gamma|^d$.

We denote by X' a maximal subset of X_n satisfying (*) $x_1 \in H_{x_2}$ for all distinct pairs $x_1, x_2 \in X'$. Note that, for any $x \in X'$, its reversed string x^R belongs to $X_d - X'$. There is no string $x \in X_d$ such that x and x^R are both in $X_d - X'$ because, otherwise, we can define $X'' = X' \cup \{x\}$, which also satisfies (*), contradicting the maximality of X'. It thus follows that $|X_d| \leq 2|X'|$.

Next, we want to claim that $|X'| \leq |\Gamma|^d$. Assume to the contrary that $|X'| > |\Gamma|^d$. By Lemma 3.17, (**) for any distinct $x_1, x_2 \in X'$, $\gamma_y^{(x_1)} \neq \gamma_{x_1}^{(x_2)}$ holds for every $y \in H_{x_1}$. Let $X' = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m\}$ with $m > |\Gamma|^d$. Choose a set $\{\xi_i\}_{i \in [m]}$ of stack contents as follows: $\xi_m = \gamma_{x_1}^{(x_m)}$ and $\xi_i = \gamma_{x_{i+1}}^{(x_i)}$ for each $i \in [m-1]$. From (**), it follows that $\xi_i \neq \xi_j$ for any distinct $i, j \in [m]$. Since $\{\xi_i\}_{i \in [m]} \subseteq \mathcal{E}$, $|\mathcal{E}| \geq m$ follows immediately. Since $m > |\Gamma|^d$, we conclude that $|\mathcal{E}| > |\Gamma|^d$. This is a contradiction. Therefore, $|X_d| \leq |\Gamma|^d$ must hold.

Since $|X_d| \leq 2|X'|$, we obtain $|X_d| \leq 2|\Gamma|^d$. From $D_{(2,3)} = U_d \cup X_d$, we obtain $|U_d| = |D_{(2,3)}| - |X_d| \geq |D_{(2,3)}| - 2|\Gamma|^d$.

Finally, let us close Case 1 by drawing a contradiction. Here, we set $d = \log_{|\Gamma|}(|D_{(2,3)}|/4)$. This implies that $2|\Gamma|^d = |D_{(2,3)}|/2$ and also $d \geq (n-4)/\log|\Gamma|$. By Proposition 3.16, at least $|D_{(2,3)}| - 2|\Gamma|^d$ $(= |D_{2,3)}|/2)$ elements x in $D_{(2,3)}$ make $\gamma_y^{(x)}$ for a certain $y \in H_x$ satisfy $|\gamma_y^{(x)}| \geq d$ $(\geq (n-4)/\log|\Gamma|)$. However, Proposition 3.7 indicates that, except for at most d_2 elements in $D_{(2,3)}$, all $x \in D_{(2,3)}$ satisfy $|\gamma_y^{(x)}| \leq d_1$ for all $y \in H_x$, where d_1 and d_2 are absolute constants. Since n is sufficiently large, there exists a string $x \in D_{(2,3)}$ for which $|\gamma_y^{(x)}| \geq (n-4)/\log|\Gamma|$ and $|\gamma_y^{(x)}| \leq d_1$. We then obtain a contradiction, as requested, and therefore this closes Case 1.

3.6 Case 2: $D_{(1,2)}$ is Large for Infinitely Many Lengths

We have already proven Case 1 in Sections 3.3–3.5. To complete the proof of Proposition 3.2, however, we still need to examine the remaining second case where $\{n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \mid |D_{(2,3)}| \geq 2^n/2\}$ is a finite set, implying that $|D_{(1,2)}| > 2^n/2$ holds for all but finitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Instead of building an argument similar to Case 1, we instead make a quite different approach. Let us recall from Section 3.2 the introduction of our colored automaton $M = (Q, \Sigma, \{¢, \$\}, \Gamma, I_3, \delta, q_0, Z_0, Q_{acc}, Q_{rej})$ with $Q_{acc} = \{q_{acc}\}$ and $Q_{rej} = \{q_{rej}\}$ that computes g. Before starting the intended proof for the second case, we present a general statement, ensuring the existence of another colored automaton "simulating" M on inputs in a backward fashion.

Proposition 3.18 *There exists a colored automaton M^R that satisfies the following: M accepts $x_1\#x_2\#x_3$ along an accepting (i,j)-computation path if and only if M^R accepts $x_3^R\#x_2^R\#x_1^R$ along an accepting $(4-j, 4-i)$-computation path.*

Proof. Under our assumption that the colored automaton M computes g. Here, we wish to describe the desired colored automaton $M^R = (Q^R, \Sigma, \{¢', \$'\}, \Gamma, I_3, \delta^R, q_0', \{q_{acc}'\}, \{q_{rej}'\})$. For clarity, we use different notations ¢′ and $′ for two endmarkers of M^R. Let w be any input of the form $x_1\#x_2\#x_3$ given to M. To make our proof simpler, we first modify M so that it must empty its stack before or at scanning \$ along any accepting computation path.

Intuitively, we start with an accepting state of M by placing a tape head onto the endmarker \$, and nondeterministically traverse a computation of M on w backward by moving its tape head leftward from \$ to ¢. To maintain the color scheme, we initially guess a color and use only stack symbols of the same color during the reverse simulation of M. If we successfully enter the initial state of M after reaching ¢, then we accept the input. Otherwise, we reject the input after scanning ¢.

More formally, the desired M^R takes the input of the form w^R $(= x_3^R\#x_2^R\#x_1^R)$. Define $q_0' = q_{acc}$ and $q_{acc}' = q_0$. The machine M^R starts with an initial state q_0' with its tape head on ¢′. The machine M^R guesses (i.e., chooses nondeterministically) a color $(i,j) \in I_3$ and remembers it until the end of computation. Let us define the transition function δ^R of M^R. Here, we assume that M^R is in state q with stack content $\gamma = z\xi$ and its input tape head being on a cell containing σ. It is important to note that color (i,j) for M is translated to color $(4-j, 4-i)$ for M^R due to ac access to the reversed inputs. Now, we assume that M has a transition of the form $(q,\eta) \in \delta(p,\sigma,\xi)$ with $0 \leq |\eta| \leq 2$. We separately discuss three possible cases, depending on the size of η.

(1) When $\eta = \eta_1\eta_2$ with $|\eta| = 2$, M^R removes η and changes its inner state from q to p by two the following steps. We first introduce a new inner state $\hat{q}$ and then define $(\hat{q}, \lambda) \in \delta^R(q, \sigma, \eta_1)$ and $(p, \xi) \in \delta^R(\hat{q}, \lambda, \eta_2)$. Note that the second step is a λ-move.
(2) When $|\eta| = 1$, we define $(p, \xi) \in \delta^R(q, \sigma, \eta)$.
(3) When $\eta = \lambda$, we define $(p, \xi\tau) \in \delta^R(q, \sigma, \tau)$ for all stack symbols $\tau \in \Gamma_{(i,j)}$.

At last, when scanning \$′, if $q \neq q_0$, then we define $\delta^R(q, \$', \tau) = \{(q_{rej}', \tau)\}$ for any $q \in Q - Q_{halt}$. Otherwise, define $\delta^R(q_0, \$', \tau) = \{(q_{acc}', \tau)\}$.

It is not difficult to verify that M^R correctly "simulates" M in a reversible manner. □

Let us return to our proof for Case 2, in which, by running M on inputs of the form $x\#x^R\#x$ for $x \in \{0,1\}^n$, we obtain $|D_{(1,2)}| > 2^n/2$ for infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Here, by Proposition 3.18, we take another colored automaton M^R "simulating" M in a reversible manner on inputs in reverse. By Lemma 3.4, we can convert M^R to one in an ideal shape. For the ease of notation, we use the same notation M^R to express the converted machine. A counterpart of $D_{(1,2)}$, denoted by $D_{(2,3)}^R$, is obtained by running M^R, instead of M, on the input $x\#x^R\#x$. By the construction of M^R in the proof of Proposition 3.18, we can conclude that $|D_{(2,3)}^R| > 2^n/2$ holds for infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Now, we apply an argument used for Case 1 to $D_{(2,3)}^R$, and we then drive an intended contradiction. We have therefore completed the entire proof of Proposition 3.2.

4 Future Challenges

Throughout this paper, we have discussed a question of whether multi-valued partial functions can be refined by certain single-valued partial functions. For NFA functions, Kobayashi [6] solved this refinement question affirmatively. Konstantinidis, Santean, and Yu [7] tackled the same question for CFL functions and obtained a partial solution but left the question open. In this paper, we have answered the question negatively by proving that UCFL2V $\not\sqsubseteq_{ref}$ CFLSV (Theorem 1.4). Notice that CFLSV is the same as CFL1V. In a

natural, analogous way, we can expand our interest from UCFL2V and CFLSV to unambiguous $(k(n)+1)$-valued and $k(n)$-valued function families, UCFL$(k(n)+1)$V and UCFL$(k(n))$V for any appropriately chosen function $k : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}^+$, where "$n$" refers to input length. Here, we wish to raise a more general question of the following form regarding unambiguous $(k(n)+1)$-valued CFL functions.

Question 4.1 *Is it true that* UCFL$(k(n)+1)$V $\sqsubseteq_{ref}$ CFL$(k(n))$V*?*

It is not clear that the proof argument of this paper can be straightforwardly extended to solve this general question. However, we conjecture that a negative solution is possible to attain for any reasonable function $k(n)$.

As another type of extension, Yamakami [14] partially settled the refinement question for Σ_k^{CFL}MV in the CFLMV hierarchy when $k \geq 3$, where the CFLMV hierarchy was defined in [14] as follows. Given a function class $\mathcal{F}$, its complement class co-$\mathcal{F}$ is composed of all functions $f : \Sigma^* \to \Gamma^*$ such that there exist a function $g \in \mathcal{F}$, two constants $a, b \geq 0$, and a number $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ for which $f(x) = \Gamma^{\leq a|x|+b} - g(x)$ for all $x \in \Sigma^{\geq n_0}$, where $\Sigma^{\geq k}$ (resp., $\Sigma^{\leq k}$) denotes the set of all strings of length $\geq k$ (resp., $\leq k$). Let $\Sigma_1^{\mathrm{CFL}}\mathrm{MV} = \mathrm{CFLMV}$, $\Pi_k^{\mathrm{CFL}}\mathrm{MV} = \text{co-}\Sigma_k^{\mathrm{CFL}}\mathrm{MV}$, and $\Sigma_{k+1}^{\mathrm{CFL}}\mathrm{MV} = \mathrm{CFLMV}_T^{\Sigma_k^{\mathrm{CFL}}}$ for $k \geq 1$, where $\mathrm{CFLMV}_T^{\mathcal{C}}$ is a collection of multi-valued partial functions that are computed by *oracle npda's*, which are allowed to access oracle $A \in \mathcal{C}$ adaptively, running in $O(n)$ time for inputs of length n. However, as noted in Section 1, we do not know any answer to the following question.

Question 4.2 *Does* $\Sigma_2^{\mathrm{CFL}}\mathrm{MV} \sqsubseteq_{ref} \Sigma_2^{\mathrm{CFL}}\mathrm{SV}$ *hold?*

We also expect that this refinement question could be solved negatively.

Appendix: Proof of Lemma 3.4

Lemma 3.4 guarantees that it suffices for us to consider only colored automata *in an ideal shape*. In Section 3, we have used this fact extensively; however, we have left the lemma unproven in Section 3.2. Here, we will provide a sketch of its proof, in which we render a procedure of how to convert any colored automaton M to its "equivalent" colored automaton N in an ideal shape. A fundamental idea for this procedure comes from the conversion of any context-free grammar to Greibach Normal Form (see, e.g., [5]).

Let $M = (Q, \Sigma, \{\mathfrak{c}, \$\}, \Gamma, C, \delta, q_0, Z_0, Q_{acc}, Q_{rej})$ be any colored automaton with a color partition $\{\Gamma_\xi\}_{\xi \in C}$ of Γ except for Z_0. In what follows, we will construct another colored automaton N in an ideal shape that can simulate M. Let $N = (Q', \Sigma, \{\mathfrak{c}, \$\}, \Gamma', C, \delta', q_0, Z_0, \{q'_{acc}\}, \{q'_{rej}\})$. Hereafter, we will describe how to convert M into N step by step. To clarify each step of modification, with a slight abuse of the symbols, we want to use δ, Q, and Γ to indicate the existing function and sets that have been already modified at the previous step and we use δ' and Γ' for their newly modified versions at the current step. Note that the conversion method given below also works for the case where all computation paths are not required to terminate in linear time.

(1) As a basic transformation, we first remove from Γ all stack symbols that never be used in any computation of M on any input. Those symbols are called *useless*. Next, we restrict Q_{acc} and Q_{rej} to $\{q'_{acc}\}$ and $\{q'_{rej}\}$, respectively, by reassigning all $q \in Q_{acc}$ (resp., $q \in Q_{rej}$) to q'_{acc} (resp., q'_{rej}). Finally, we modify the machine so that it never enters any halting state before scanning \$. For this purpose, we postpone the timing of entering any halting state by introducing a dummy accepting state and a dummy rejecting state and by staying those states in moving an input-tape head to the right until the tape head eventually arrives at \$.

(2) We convert Q to $Q' = \{q_0, q, q'_{acc}, q'_{rej}\}$ by encoding the changes of inner states into stack symbols in a nondeterministic fashion. We modify (i) a transition $(r, c_1c_2\cdots c_k) \in \delta(q_0, \mathfrak{c}, Z_0)$ to $(q, \left[\begin{smallmatrix} rp_1 \\ c_1 \end{smallmatrix}\right]\left[\begin{smallmatrix} p_1p_2 \\ c_2 \end{smallmatrix}\right]\cdots\left[\begin{smallmatrix} p_kp_{k+1} \\ c_k \end{smallmatrix}\right]\left[\begin{smallmatrix} p_{k+2}p_{k+3} \\ Z_0 \end{smallmatrix}\right]) \in \delta'(q_0, \mathfrak{c}, Z_0)$ for all possible inner states $p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_{k+3} \in Q$ satisfying $p_2, p_4, \ldots, p_{k+2} \notin Q_{halt}$, (ii) a transition $(r, c_1c_2\cdots c_k) \in \delta(p, \sigma, a)$ with $\sigma \in \check{\Sigma} \cup \{\lambda\}$ and $p \neq q_0$ to $(q, [\begin{smallmatrix} rp_1 \\ c_1 \end{smallmatrix}][\begin{smallmatrix} p_1p_2 \\ c_2 \end{smallmatrix}]\cdots[\begin{smallmatrix} p_kp_{k+1} \\ c_k \end{smallmatrix}]) \in \delta'(q, \sigma, [\begin{smallmatrix} pr \\ a \end{smallmatrix}])$, and (iii) a transition $(q', w) \in \delta(p, \sigma, a)$ for $q' \in Q_{halt}$ and $\sigma \in \check{\Sigma} \cup \{\lambda\}$ to $(q', [\begin{smallmatrix} pq' \\ a \end{smallmatrix}]) \in \delta'(q, \sigma, [\begin{smallmatrix} pq' \\ a \end{smallmatrix}])$, where $[\begin{smallmatrix} pr \\ a \end{smallmatrix}]$, $[\begin{smallmatrix} p_ip_{i+1} \\ c_i \end{smallmatrix}]$, $[\begin{smallmatrix} pq' \\ a \end{smallmatrix}]$ are all new stack symbols. Here, we paint those new symbols in the same color as a and c_i have.

(3) We supplement all missing transitions (if any) with special transitions that directly guide to the unique rejecting state q'_{rej}.

(4) We eliminate all transitions of the form $(q, \lambda) \in \delta(q, \lambda, a)$. After this step, no λ-move deletes a stack symbol. This elimination is done by finding so-called *nullable symbols* as follows. A stack symbol a is nullable if there is a transition of the form $(q, \lambda) \in \delta(q, \lambda, a)$. When a transition $(q, b_1b_2\cdots b_k) \in \delta(q, \lambda, a)$ exists and

all b_i's are nullable, a is also nullable. Associated with each transition $(q, c_1c_2\cdots c_k) \in \delta(q,\lambda,a)$, we include all transitions of the form $(q, e_1e_2\cdots e_k) \in \delta'(q,\lambda,a)$ satisfying that (i) $e_1e_2\cdots e_k \neq \lambda$, (ii) $e_i = c_i$ if c_i is not nullable, and (iii) $e_i \in \{c_i, \lambda\}$ if c_i is nullable.

(5) We remove all transitions that make *single-symbol replacement*, namely, transitions of the form $(q, b) \in \delta(q,\lambda,a)$ for $a, b \in \Gamma$. From the existing set of transitions, we first choose all transitions that do not have the above form and make them new transitions of δ'. We then define a new transition $(q, w) \in \delta'(q,\lambda,a)$ if a transition $(q, w) \in \delta(q,\lambda,b)$ exists and M transforms a to b along a certain computation subpath without using the transition $(q, b) \in \delta(q,\lambda,a)$.

(6) We delay the start of a loop given by the transition of the form $(q, au) \in \delta(q,\lambda,a)$. The following *loop-delay conversion* eliminates this form entirely. Assume that there are transitions $(q, au) \in \delta(q,\lambda,a)$ and $(q, w) \in \delta(q,\sigma,a)$ with $\sigma \in \check{\Sigma} \cup \{\lambda\}$ and $w \notin a\Gamma^*$. We introduce a new symbol b (in the same color as a's) and introduce new transitions $(q, u) \in \delta'(q,\lambda,b)$, $(q, ub) \in \delta'(q,\lambda,b)$, and $(q, wb) \in \delta'(q,\sigma,a)$.

(7) We eliminate all λ-moves made while reading inputs (including the endmarkers). Let $\Gamma = \{a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_k\}$ be a stack alphabet defined at the previous step with $a_0 = Z_0$. This step is composed of three substeps (i)–(iii).

(i) First, we inductively modify the transitions (and also adding extra new symbols) so that, for any pair $i, j \in [0,k]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, $(q, a_iu) \in \delta'(q,\lambda,a_j)$ implies $i > j$. For each $j = 0, 1, \ldots, k$, choose $i = 0, 1, \ldots, j-1$ sequentially and conduct the following modifications (a)–(b). (a) When a transition $(q, a_iu) \in \delta(q,\lambda,a_j)$ exists for $u \in \Gamma^*$, we include transitions $(q, wu) \in \delta'(q,\sigma,a_j)$ and $(q, w) \in \delta'(q,\sigma,a_i)$ for each transition $(q, w) \in \delta(q,\sigma,a_i)$ with $\sigma \in \check{\Sigma} \cup \{\lambda\}$ (and $w \notin a_i\Gamma^*$ by (6)). (b) Next, for each transition of the form $(q, a_ju) \in \delta(q,\lambda,a_j)$ (possibly) generated in (a), we apply the loop-delay conversion of (6) by introducing a new symbol b_j whose color is set to be the same as a_j.

(ii) For each $j = k-1, k-2, \ldots, 0$ chosen sequentially, if $(q, a_iu) \in \delta(q,\lambda,a_j)$ with $i > j$ exists, then we add $(q, wu) \in \delta'(q,\sigma,a_j)$ for each transition $(q, w) \in \delta(q,\sigma,a_i)$ with $\sigma \in \check{\Sigma}$ (notice that w does not begin with a symbol in $\{a_{i+1}, a_{i+2}, \ldots, a_k\}$).

(iii) For the newly added b_j's, we have only transitions of the form $(q, w) \in \delta(q,\lambda,b_j)$ with w beginning with a_i's. Associated with each transition of the form $(q, a_iu) \in \delta(q,\lambda,b_j)$, we include $(q, wu) \in \delta'(q,\sigma,b_j)$ for each transition $(q, w) \in \delta(q,\sigma,a_i)$ with $\sigma \in \check{\Sigma}$.

(8) Finally, we reduce to at most 2 the number of stack symbols pushed simultaneously intothe stack. Consider the set $A = \{w \mid \exists p, p' \in Q\, \exists a \in \Gamma\, \exists \sigma \in \check{\Sigma}\, [(p', w) \in \delta(p,\sigma,a)]\} \cup \Gamma$. Let Γ' consist of all symbols $[u]$ for all initial segments u of w in A and all symbols $[bw]$ for $b \in \Gamma - \{Z_0\}$ and $w \in A$. For simplicity, let $[\lambda] = \lambda$. If $(q, w) \in \delta(q_0, \not\vdash, Z_0)$ exists, then we include a transition $(q, [w][Z_0]) \in \delta'(q_0, \not\vdash, [Z_0])$, where $[Z_0]$ is the new bottom marker. For each transition $(q, w) \in \delta(q,\sigma,b)$ with $\sigma \in \check{\Sigma}$, we define $(q, [w][u]) \in \delta'(q,\sigma,[bu])$ for any u satisfying $[bu] \in \Gamma'$. Moreover, if a transition $(q,\lambda) \in \delta(q,\sigma,b)$ exists, then we include transitions $(q, [u]) \in \delta'(q,\sigma,[bu])$ for any u with $[bu] \in \Gamma'$. The colors of $[w]$, $[u]$, and $[u]$ are the same as all symbols in w, u, and bu, respectively.

References

[1] C. Choffrut and K. Culik. Properties of finite and pushdown transducers. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 12 (1983) 300–315.

[2] R. J. Evey. Application of pushdown-store machines. In the *Proc. of the 1963 Fall Joint Computer Conference*, AFIPS Press, pp. 215–227, 1963.

[3] S. A. Fenner, S. Homer, M. Ogihara, and A. Selman. Oracles that compute values. *SIAM J. Comput.* (1997) 1043–1065.

[4] P. C. Fisher. On computability by certain classes of restricted Turing machines. In the *Proc. of the 4th Annual IEEE Symp. on Switching Circuit Theory and Logical Design* (SWCT'63), IEEE Computer Society, pp. 23–32, 1963.

[5] J. E. Hopcroft and J. D. Ullman. *Introduction to Automata Theory, Languages, and Computation.* Addison-Wesley, 1979.

[6] K. Kobayashi. Classification of formal languages by functional binary transductions. *Inform. Control*, 15 (1969) 95–109.

[7] S. Konstantinidis, N. Santean, and S. Yu. Representation and uniformization of algebraic transductions. *Acta Inform.*, 43 (2007) 395–417.

[8] A. L. Selman. A taxonomy of complexity classes of functions. *J. Comput. System Sci.*, 48 (1994) 357–381.

[9] A. L. Selman. Much ado about functions. In the *Proc. of the 11th Annual IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity*, pp. 198–212, 1996.

[10] K. Tadaki, T. Yamakami, and J. C. H. Lin. Theory of one-tape linear-time Turing machines. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 411 (2010) 22–43. An extended abstract appeared in the Proc. of the 30th Conference on Current Trends in Theory and Practice of Computer Science (SOFSEM 2004), Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer, vol. 2932, pp. 335–348, 2004.

[11] T. Yamakami. Swapping lemmas for regular and context-free languages. Manuscript, 2008. Available at arXiv:0808.4122.

[12] T. Yamakami. Immunity and pseudorandomness of context-free languages. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 412 (2011) 6432–6450.

[13] T. Yamakami. Oracle pushdown automata, nondeterministic reducibilities, and the hierarchy over the family of context-free languages. In the *Proc. of the 40th International Conference on Current Trends in Theory and Practice of Computer Science* (SOFSEM 2014), Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer, vol. 8327, pp. 514–525, 2014. A complete version is available at arXiv:1303.1717.

[14] T. Yamakami. Structural complexity of multi-valued partial functions computed by nondeterministic pushdown automata. In the *Proc. of the 15th Italian Conference on Theoretical Computer Science* (ICTCS 2014), CEUR Workshop Proceedings 1231, pp. 225–236, 2014. Available also at arXiv:1508.05814.

[15] T. Yamakami. Pseudorandom generators against advised context-free languages. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 613 (2016) 1–27.